UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,487	07/25/2003	Timothy R. Machold	RADME-64498	4201
24201 FULWIDER PA	7590 07/10/200 ATTON LLP	EXAMINER		
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6060 CENTER DRIVE, TENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			NASSER, ROBERT L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3735	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/627,487	MACHOLD ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	ROBERT L. NASSER	3735		
The MAILING DATE of this communic Period for Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commul  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statu.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply with Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a redication.  Utory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ill, by statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION.  reply be timely filed  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed     This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2th     Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice.	o)∏ This action is non-final. or allowance except for formal matt	-		
Disposition of Claims				
4)  Claim(s) 30 and 32-35 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 30, 32-35 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction	e withdrawn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objecti Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the specific shape of the sp	a) accepted or b) objected to ion to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan he correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	O-948) Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 		

Application/Control Number: 10/627,487 Page 2

Art Unit: 3735

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Saab 5624392 in view of Saringer 5895418, and Utterberg et al 6383158, Noda et al 6146411 and Hyatt 4800823. Saab shows a heat exchange catheter system having a heat exchange catheter, but it does not show the fluid supply structure. Saringer teaches in figures 22-24 a device to supply heat exchange fluid to a heat exchange device, a pad in this case, including a reservoir 320, a pump 314 which includes a pump head, an air vent 360 (see column 10, lines 47-50), an external heat exchanger 310, and an external fluid supply 320. The examiner notes that the fluid supply is external to the pump and heat exchanger. It would have been obvious to modify Saab to use such a fluid supply circuit, as it is merely the use of a known circuit to supply fluid to devices like Saab. The examiner notes that the embodiment is shown with all of the components open, with a housing 28 as shown in figure 1. The examiner takes official notice that it is well know to provide a cover, or bulkhead, on such a device, to prevent damage to or contamination of the components. The combination does not have vents that do not allow passage of liquid. Utterberg further teaches a hydrophobic vent is another known method to eliminate air from a fluid line. Hence, it would have been obvious to modify the combination to use such a vent, as it is merely the substitution of one known equivalent air removal technique for another. The combination performs the

Application/Control Number: 10/627,487 Page 3

Art Unit: 3735

steps of the method in claim 30. Noda further teaches providing a level sensor in the fluid supply circuit and shutting off the fluid when the level is too low. As such, it would have been obvious to modify the combination to us ea fluid level sensor, to ensure patient safety. The combination does not activate a valve to add fluid into the circuit. Hyatt is select from many references that teach refilling a fluid circuit when the levels are too low by opening a valve in response to the level sensor. Hence, it would have been obvious to modify the combination to use such a refill circuit, to eliminate the need for human interaction and to provide for continuous use.

Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saab in view of Saringer, and Utterberg et al, Noda, and Hyatt, as applied to claim 30 above, further in view of Leung 4548212. Leung teaches damping chambers 26 and 27 for damping pressure variations in the flow to eliminate turbulence. Hence, it would have been obvious to modify Fontenot to use such a dampener, to avoid turbulence and provide a more uniform distribution of temperature.

Claims 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saab in view of Saringer, Utterberg et al, Noda, and Hyatt as applied to claim 30 above, further in view of Kolen et al 5980561. Kolen teaches using a constant pressure circulation pump in column 6, line 41. The examiner takes official notice that is known to drive a pump to produce constant pressure out by supplying it with constant current. Hence, it would have been obvious to modify the above combination, as it is merely the substitution of one known equivalent pump for another.

Applicant's arguments filed 4/1/2008 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

To clarify, it is the examiner's position that it would have been obvious to include a cover housing, or bulkhead, on the device in figure 22, to prevent damage to the components.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT L. NASSER whose telephone number is (571)272-4731. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor II can be reached on 571 272-4730. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/627,487 Page 5

Art Unit: 3735

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert L. Nasser Jr/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3735

RLN July 4, 2008